

Schmalian and Wolynes Reply: The numerical results presented by Grousson *et al.*¹ confirm that the model we studied in Ref.² exhibits self-generated glassiness, which was the major claim of Ref.². The decrease of the freezing temperature with increasing frustration parameter, Q , (as inferred from Fig. 1 of Ref.¹) also agrees with our prediction. Furthermore, Grousson *et al.* show that the temperature dependence of the slow relaxation time can indeed be well described using the Vogel-Fulcher law which we proposed based on an entropic droplet argument. Finally, analyzing the Q -dependence of the fragility parameter D , Grousson *et al.* find that it behaves similar to $D \sim Q^{1/2}$ and argue, assuming $D^{-1} \sim \frac{dS_c}{dT}|_{T_K}$ with configurational entropy S_c and Kauzmann temperature T_K , that this disagrees with our theory which gives $\frac{dS_c}{dT}|_{T_K} \rightarrow 0$ as $Q \rightarrow 0$.

We did not study the Q -dependence of D in our paper. Using simple estimates for $D(Q)$ we find that there actually is no scientific disagreement between the results of Ref.¹ and our theory. Indeed, we showed in our Letter that $\sim \frac{dS_c}{dT}|_{T_K}$ vanishes as Q goes to zero. For glass forming molecular liquids $\frac{dS_c}{dT}|_{T_K}$ and the parameter D^{-1} are proportional, both empirically and theoretically⁵. Thus it is natural to conclude that D itself must grow for decreasing Q . However, for the stripe glass system discussed in our paper we also pointed out (see below Eq. 10 of our Letter) that the coefficient D in question is not only determined by the configurational entropy but also by the bare surface tension of entropic droplets, σ_0 , via

$$D \sim \frac{\sigma_0^2}{\frac{dS_c}{dT}|_{T_K}}. \quad (1)$$

σ_0 itself depends strongly on the frustration parameter and overshadows the Q -dependence of $\frac{dS_c}{dT}|_{T_K}$ in Eq. 1. Thus, we find that $D(Q \rightarrow 0) \rightarrow 0$, in agreement with the results of Ref.¹.

We now summarize our calculations for the Q -dependence of $\frac{dS_c}{dT}|_{T_K}$ and σ_0 . Using an analytical theory³, which agrees quantitatively very well with the numerical solution of the self consistent screening approximation², gives $S_c(T_A) \sim Q^{3/4}$. Since $S_c(T_K) = 0$ we estimate with good accuracy $\frac{dS_c}{dT}|_{T_K} \simeq S_c(T_A)/(T_A - T_K)$. $T_A - T_K$ weakly depends on Q for larger Q and increases due to additional logarithmic corrections for small $Q < 0.04$. It follows that $\frac{dS_c}{dT}|_{T_K} \sim Q^\tau$ with $\tau = \frac{3}{4}$ for larger Q and a behavior which is closer to $\tau \simeq 1$ for smaller Q (logarithmic corrections actually spoil a pure power-law, an effect which is however very hard to identify from a plot of $\frac{dS_c}{dT}|_{T_K}$).

Next we estimate $\sigma_0(Q)$ for small Q . In this limit there is, in addition to the usual gradient term (studied in Ref.² to analyze σ_0 for larger Q) a contribution to the surface energy which results from the Coulomb term of the Hamiltonian, $E_{\text{surface}}^C \sim \varphi_0^2 l_m^{-1} R^2$. Here, φ_0 is a typical local amplitude of the charge field of the model, R

is the droplet radius and $l_m \sim Q^{-1/4}$ is the modulation length of the state⁴. The Q dependence of φ_0 can be obtained from a variational argument: we make the ansatz $\varphi(r) = \varphi_0 \cos(rQ^{1/4})$ for a modulated structure, insert it into the Hamiltonian and minimize with respect to φ_0 . It follows $\varphi_0^2 \sim Q^{1/2}$, a result which we recently used in Ref.³. This gives a bare surface tension which behaves as $\sigma_0 \sim \varphi_0^2 l_m^{-1} \sim Q^{3/4}$ as $Q \rightarrow 0$. It then follows from Eq. 1 that

$$D(Q) \sim Q^\mu \quad (2)$$

with $\mu = \frac{3}{2} - \tau \simeq \frac{1}{2}$ if one uses the effective exponent $\tau \simeq 1$ for the slope of the configurational entropy at smaller Q . We conclude that D grows in a fashion similar to a square root for small Q (a pure power-law is spoiled by logarithmic corrections). Certainly, a more sophisticated replica-instanton calculation is called for to solidify these estimates. Nevertheless, the presented calculation seems to agree rather well with the simulations presented by Grousson *et al.*¹.

The claim by Grousson *et al.*¹ that our theory disagrees with their numerical simulations is based on the assumption that the surface tension σ_0 is independent of the frustration parameter Q . However, we showed in this Reply that σ_0 varies strongly with Q such that D^{-1} and $\frac{dS_c}{dT}|_{T_K}$ become independent measures of the fragility. We believe that this answers the questions raised in Ref.¹. What is great about these stripe glasses is they present the possibility of experimentally decoupling the fragility as measured from thermodynamics and as measured from kinetics, which has proved impossible for molecular liquids. We are grateful to Grousson *et al.* that they brought up this issue.

This work has been supported by NSF (P. G. W.), Grant No. ChE-9530680 and Ames Laboratory, operated for the U. S. Department of Energy by Iowa State University under Contract No. W-7405-Eng-82 (J. S.). We acknowledge helpful discussions with H. Westfahl Jr.

Jörg Schmalian,

Department of Physics and Astronomy and

Ames Laboratory, Iowa State University, Ames, IA 50011

Peter G. Wolynes,

Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry,

University of California at San Diego, La Jolla, CA 92093

¹ M. Grousson, G. Tarjus, and P. Viot, preceding Comment, Phys. Rev. Lett. ???

² J. Schmalian and P. G. Wolynes, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 836 (2000).

³ J. Schmalian, H. Westfahl Jr., and P. G. Wolynes, to appear in Intl. Journ. of Mod. Phys. B.

⁴ Nussinov et al. Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 472 (1999).

⁵ X. Xia and P. Wolynes, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. **97**, 2990 (2000).